# APPENDIX A

# EUC PROVISIONS, BY PHASE

A-2

TABLE A.1

SUMMARY OF THE FIVE PHASES OF EUC

| EUC Phase | Public Law | Date Enacted | Dates of Eligibility | | Duration and Trigger Levels | EB | Funding | Options to Claim | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Effective | Termination | | | | | |
| 1 | 102-164 (the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991) | November 15, 1991 | November 17, 1991<br><br>Reachback provisions for those whose benefit year ended after February 28, 1991 | July 4, 1992 | Created three tiers of EUC benefit durations, at 6, 13, or 20 weeks. States had 13 weeks if the AIUR was at least 4 percent in the preceding 12 weeks and the current week or if the AIUR was 2.5 percent and the exhaustion rate 29 percent. States had 20 weeks if the AIUR was at least 5 percent in the preceding 12 weeks and the current week or if the average TUR was at least 9 percent in the previous 6 months. | Allowed governors to deactivate EB to pay EUC. In states in which EB was in use, claimants received EUC benefits only after EB benefits were exhausted and only the amount in excess of the amount paid through EB. | Funds in the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account (EUCA) were used. A one-year extension of the 0.2 percent Federal Unemployment Tax Act surtax and a variety of offsets and tax extensions were used to meet Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) requirements. | | |
| | 102-182 | December 4, 1991 | Retroactive to November 17, 1991 | June 13, 1992 | Eliminated the 6-week tier; for those states, individuals were eligible for 13 weeks. | | | | |
| 2 | 102-244 | February 7, 1992 | February 8, 1992 | July 4, 1992 | Weeks of maximum benefits were increased to either 26 or 33 weeks, subject to a maximum of 130 percent of a claimant's regular benefit payments, for claimants filing initial claims from February 9, 1992, to June 13, 1992. For claimants filing after June 13, 1992, or for claimants with nonconsecutive weeks claimed, the maximum benefits were decreased to either 13 or 20 weeks. | | BEA funding requirements were met via a temporary acceleration in payments of corporate income taxes and carryover pay-as-you-go financing from earlier entitlement legislation. | | |

A.4

| EUC Phase | Public Law | Date Enacted | Dates of Eligibility | | Duration and Trigger Levels | EB | Funding | Options to Claim | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Effective | Termination | | | | | |
| 3 | 102-318 | July 3, 1992 | Retroactive to June 13, 1992 | No new claims after March 6, 1993. No payments after June 19, 1993. | Set EUC durations to either 20 or 26 weeks, subject to a maximum of 100 percent of a claimant's regular benefit payments for the most recent benefit year.<br><br>Benefit durations dropped to either 10 or 15 weeks, subject to a maximum of 60 percent of a claimant's regular benefits, depending on the state unemployment rate when the seasonally adjusted national TUR was 6.8-7 percent for 2 consecutive months.<br><br>Benefit durations dropped to either 7 or 13 weeks, subject to a maximum of 60 percent of a claimant's regular benefits, depending on the state unemployment rate when the seasonally adjusted national TUR was less than 6.8 percent for 2 consecutive months. | Governors' option to deactivate EB to pay EUC was not applicable for any EB period beginning after March 6, 1993. New claimants in states that used EB and had an EUC balance after March 6, 1993, could receive payments from the program (EB or EUC) with the greater balance.<br><br>Allowance for usage of 3-month average TUR as trigger for EB. Changed EB durations from exactly 13 to either 13 or 20 weeks. | All EUC benefits funded by general revenue funds deposited in the EUCA, satisfying BEA requirements through several non-UI income and tax adjustments and carryover pay-as-you-go financing from earlier legislation. | An individual could defer rights to regular UI benefits for weeks of unemployment beginning on or after July 3, 1992, to collect EUC associated with the most recent prior benefit year. | States could use more than one method to measure employment and earnings (had at least 20 weeks of employment in the base period, earned 150 percent of the base period high quarter wages during the base period, or earned wages during the base period of at least 40 times the claimant's weekly benefit amount for regular benefits) for qualifying purposes, rather than using one method exclusively, as was required prior to July 3, 1992. |

| EUC Phase | Public Law | Date Enacted | Dates of Eligibility | | Duration and Trigger Levels | EB | Funding | Options to Claim | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Effective | Termination | | | | | |
| 4 | 103-6 | March 4, 1993 | March 6, 1993 | No new claims after October 2, 1993. No payments after January 15, 1994. | | Governors' option to deactivate EB to pay EUC was not applicable for any EB period beginning after October 2, 1993. New claimants in states that used EB and had an EUC balance after October 2, 1993, received payments in the program (EB or EUC) with the greater balance. | All EUC benefits for initial claims attributable to weeks of unemployment beginning after October 2, 1992, funded by general revenue funds included in the DOL Appropriations Acts and then transferred to the EUCA. | | Changed the work search requirements from those in the EB provisions to those in state law provisions for regular UI. |
| | 103-6 | July 26, 1993 | | | Revised interpretation of the 7 percent and 6.8 percent thresholds of the national TUR before EUC durations changed (per P.L. 102-318). The 7 percent period would be in effect when the national TUR for *each of the 2 most recent months* was less than 7 percent, rather than when the average of the 2 months was less than 7 percent. Similar interpretation for the 6.8 percent threshold. | | | | |

A 5

| EUC Phase | Public Law | Date Enacted | Dates of Eligibility | | Duration and Trigger Levels | EB | Funding | Options to Claim | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Effective | Termination | | | | | |
| 5 | 103-152 | November 24, 1993 | Retroactive to October 2, 1993 | No new claims after February 5, 1994. No payments after April 30, 1994. | Amended maximum number of benefit weeks to either 7 or 13, subject to a maximum of 50 percent of the claimant's regular benefits. | Governors' option to deactivate EB to pay EUC was not applicable for any EB period beginning after February 5, 1994. New claimants in states that used EB and had an EUC balance after February 5, 1994, received payments in the program (EB or EUC) with the greater balance. | Benefits for initial claims-attributable to unemployment beginning after October 2, 1993, were paid from the EUCA, financed through savings from profiling requirements, elimination of choice in filing, and increases in the sponsor-to-alien deeming period under Supplemental Security Income. | Repealed the option established in P.L. 102-318, whereby a claimant could choose either to file a new claim or receive EUC on the basis of a prior benefit year. | |

## TABLE A.2

## DURATIONS OF EUC BENEFITS OVER TIME, BY STATE, IN WEEKS

| | EUC-1 P.L. 102-162 and 102-182 11/17/91 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-1 in Effect | EUC-2 P.L. 102-244 2/8/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-2 in Effect | EUC-3 P.L. 102-318 6/14/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-3 in Effect | Trigger Changes from EUC-3 and EUC-4 P.L. 103-6 3/6/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-4 in Effect | EUC-5 P.L. 103-152 10/2/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-5 in Effect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| AK | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | | 15 | | 13 | 1/23/94--onto EB |
| AZ | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| AR | 13 | 2/2/92--20 | 33 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| CA | 13 | 1/5/92--20 | 33 | | 26 | | 15 | | 13 | |
| CO | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| CT | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | 11/1/92--20 | 10 | | 7 | |
| DE | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| DC | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| FL | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| GA | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| HI | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| ID | 13 | 2/9/92--20 | 33 | | 26 | 7/19/92--20 2/21/93--26 | 15 | 7/4/93--10 | 7 | |
| IL | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| IN | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| IA | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |

TABLE A.2 (continued)

| | EUC-1 P.L. 102-162 and 102-182 11/17/91 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-1 in Effect | EUC-2 P.L. 102-244 2/8/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-2 in Effect | EUC-3 P.L. 102-318 6/14/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-3 in Effect | Trigger Changes from EUC-3 and EUC-4 P.L. 103-6 3/6/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-4 in Effect | EUC-5 P.L. 103-152 10/2/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-5 in Effect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| KS | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| KY | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| LA | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| ME | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | 8/30/92--20 | 10 | 3/28/93--15 6/27/93--10 | 7 | 3/27/94--onto 20 weeks EB |
| MD | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| MA | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | 8/2/92--20 | 10 | | 7 | |
| MI | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | 10/25/92--20 | 10 | | 7 | |
| MN | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| MS | 20 | | 33 | 2/16/92--26 | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| MO | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| MT | 13 | | 26 | 3/8/92--33 | 20 | | 10 | 3/7/93--15 6/12/93--10 | 7 | |
| NE | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| NV | 13 | | 26 | 3/8/92--33 6/6/92--26 | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| NH | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| NJ | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | 11/22/92--20 | 10 | 3/7/9--15 6/13/93--10 | 7 | |
| NM | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| NY | 13 | | 26 | 2/16/92--33 | 26 | 7/12/92--20 | 10 | | 7 | |

A.8

TABLE A.2 *(continued)*

| | EUC-1 P.L. 102-162 and 102-182 11/17/91 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-1 in Effect | EUC-2 P.L. 102-244 2/8/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-2 in Effect | EUC-3 P.L. 102-318 6/14/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-3 in Effect | Trigger Changes from EUC-3 and EUC-4 P.L. 103-6 3/6/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-4 in Effect | EUC-5 P.L. 103-152 10/2/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-5 in Effect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NC | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| ND | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| OH | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| OK | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| OR | 13 | 1/12/92--20 | 33 | | 26 | 9/27/92--20 1/31/93--26 | 15 | 7/11/93--10 | 7 | 10/3/93--onto EB 2/26/94--off EB |
| PA | 13 | 1/26/92--20 | 33 | | 26 | 8/16/92--20 | 10 | 3/21/93--15 6/20/93--10 | 7 | |
| RI | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | | 15 | | 7 | 1/16/94--13 |
| SC | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| SD | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| TN | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| TX | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| UT | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| VT | 13 | 1/19/92--20 | 33 | | 26 | 8/16/92--20 | 10 | 5/09/93--15 8/8/93--10 | 7 | |
| VA | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| WA | 13 | 2/2/92--20 | 33 | | 26 | 7/4/92--20 1/31/93--26 | 15 | 6/27/93--10 | 7 | 10/3/93--onto EB 2/26/94--off EB |

TABLE A.2 *(continued)*

| | EUC-1 P.L. 102-162 and 102-182 11/17/91 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-1 in Effect | EUC-2 P.L. 102-244 2/8/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-2 in Effect | EUC-3 P.L. 102-318 6/14/92 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-3 in Effect | Trigger Changes from EUC-3 and EUC-4 P.L. 103-6 3/6/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-4 in Effect | EUC-5 P.L. 103-152 10/2/93 | State-Specific Duration Changes While EUC-5 in Effect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WV | 20 | | 33 | | 26 | | 15 | | 13 | |
| WI | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |
| WY | 13 | | 26 | | 20 | | 10 | | 7 | |

SOURCE: Unpublished table "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Periods," by U.S. Department of Labor and Federal Register, Washington, DC, U.S. Government Printing Office, various days.

# APPENDIX B

# SAMPLE DESIGN AND SAMPLE WEIGHTS

/

The sample for the Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) evaluation was designed to represent the national population of EUC recipients and to provide sufficient statistical precision to meet the descriptive and analytic objectives of the study. It was also designed to provide a comparison group of Unemployment Insurance (UI) recipients who did not receive EUC; this group was representative of the national population of UI-only recipients when EUC was available. More specifically, the sample design called for a two-stage sampling process: initially, 23 states were selected; then, recipients in those states were selected. Administrative records were to be collected and analyzed for the recipient samples and survey data were to be collected for subsamples.

In practice, a number of states selected for the sample were unable to participate. Additional states were selected and asked to participate, but, in the end, only 18 of the 35 states that were asked provided samples of recipients. In addition, response rates for the survey were low (just under 50 percent), primarily due to difficulty in locating respondents (see Appendix C).

Both state and respondent nonresponse raise the possibility that estimates from the samples may be biased. However, our analysis of this issue suggests that the administrative records samples from the 18 states can be weighted to represent the national population on key dimensions of UI receipt. Therefore, we believe that the results we obtain with these samples can be characterized as representing the nation. We use an analogous procedure to weight the 16 state survey samples to be nationally representative.[1] Furthermore, our analysis of survey nonresponse (Appendix C) suggests that the respondents are similar to nonrespondents on key demographic and UI receipt characteristics.

We now turn to a discussion of the sample design and our procedure for computing weights.

---

[1] Administrative samples from two states were received too late to be included in the survey.

## A. INITIAL SAMPLE DESIGN

The sample design for the EUC evaluation was intended to fulfill three main objectives. First, it was designed to produce a sample that was representative of the national population of EUC recipients. Second, it was intended to provide a comparison group of UI recipients who did not receive EUC that was representative of the national population of UI-only recipients when EUC was available. Third, it was meant to provide sufficient statistical precision for the descriptive and analytic objectives of the study.

To address the first objective, we defined the EUC sample frame as all individuals in the 51 states who received an EUC payment.[2] We planned to select a sample from this sample frame and to collect administrative records data for this sample. We also planned to collect survey data for a subsample but to limit the survey subsample to individuals who began collecting EUC in July 1992 or later. We restricted the survey subsample because we wanted to limit the period for which recipients were asked to recall labor market events. We chose July 1992, which was the start date of EUC Phase 3, so that the survey sample would be representative of EUC recipients in Phases 3 through 5.

To address the second objective, we defined the UI-only sample frame as all individuals in the 51 states who began collecting UI between January 1991 and September 1993 and who did not collect EUC. We chose these start and end dates for this sample to capture the majority of UI recipients who could have collected EUC. Although some individuals who began collecting UI as early as March 1990 collected EUC through its reachback provisions, the number of such individuals was small relative to the entire UI population. For this reason, we restricted the comparison group

_____

[2]We included in our universe the 50 states plus the District of Columbia. For convenience, we refer to this group as the "51 states."

to individuals who were more likely to transition to EUC if they exhausted UI. Individuals who began collecting UI in early 1991 would have exhausted UI in the second half of 1991 and could have collected EUC beginning in November 1991. We chose September 1993 as the end date for this comparison sample for similar reasons. Some individuals who started collecting UI after September could have exhausted UI and begun collecting EUC prior to February 5, when the last EUC initial claims were taken, but most individuals who ended up on EUC would have begun collecting UI earlier. Finally, we decided that the UI-only interview subsample would include UI-only recipients who began collecting UI between January 1992 and September 1993. We chose January 1992 as the start date to include individuals who would have been likely to collect EUC beginning in July 1992 or later if they had collected EUC.

To address the third objective, we decided that a reasonable precision standard for the survey subsamples would involve describing attributes of the EUC population with a ± 2.5 percent, 95 percent confidence interval and differences between the EUC and UI-only samples of ± 6.0 percent at 95 percent confidence, for attributes with an incidence of 50 percent in the population. We calculated that these objectives could be achieved with roughly 1,500 EUC and 900 UI-only sample members, if the samples were simple random samples of the national population.[3]

Because the UC program operates separately in each state, however, it was, not feasible to select simple random samples from the national population of EUC and UI-only recipients. Instead, we chose a two-stage sampling procedure that involved the random selection of states in the first stage and recipients in the second stage. Specifically, we decided to choose states in the first stage with probability proportional to the size of their EUC population and then to choose equal-sized samples

---

[3]We used a two-tail test at the 80 percent power level for this computation.

of EUC recipients in the second stage.[4] This procedure maintained equal probabilities of selection for all EUC recipients and was intended to yield a self-weighting sample of EUC recipients. A comparable UI-only sample was allocated to each state in a way that was designed to provide a self-weighting sample of such individuals.[5]

Because of the two-stage sample design, we also had to increase the EUC and UI-only sample sizes to take into account the loss of statistical precision (termed the "design effect") resulting from clustering the sample in a limited number of states. To account for the importance of design effects, we considered the degree to which average UI benefit duration varies across states.[6] In 1991,

_____

[4]Since the EUC caseload was heavily concentrated in a few states, this procedure was modified slightly to allow for the fact that the sample would definitely contain the largest states. Once these states were identified, sample sizes were allocated to them in proportion to their representation in the national caseload. The remaining states were then selected with probabilities proportional to size, with equal size samples being allocated to each state.

[5]To draw a nationally representative sample of regular UI-only recipients, we needed to account for the fact that the selection probabilities of states were relative to the EUC population, rather than to regular UI-only recipients or to recipients in general. Following the approach used in an earlier study, regular UI-only recipients were sampled with equal probabilities of selection by allocating larger numbers of regular UI-only recipients to states with smaller numbers of EUC recipients, according to the following formula (Corson and Dynarski 1990):

$$(1) \quad Q_j = X_j \left[ (1 - E_j) / E_j \right] R.$$

where, for state $j$, $Q_j$ is the regular UI-only sample. $X_j$ is the expected size of the subsample of our sample of EUC claimants who collected regular UI earlier in their unemployment spells, $E_j$ is the ratio of the total number of EUC recipients who previously collected UI in the state to the total number of UI recipients in the state. and $R$ is the uniform sampling rate required to adjust the size of the UI-only sample to the desired total number.

[6]We used average benefit duration for regular UI to assess the importance of design effects. Although other variables would yield different results, we expected that the variation among states on this variable would indicate variation in important outcome variables, such as duration of EUC receipt.

average UI duration nationwide was 15.8 weeks; however, an examination of average duration by

state revealed important systematic variation. Average duration was more than 17 weeks in five

states and less than 12 weeks in nine states. Because earlier studies of the UI population (see, for

example, Corson and Dynarski 1990) suggested that the total variance in average UI duration is

about 144 weeks, we used the variation in state-level averages to estimate the state component of

variance and allocated total variance between individuals and states as follows:[7]

| Variance Component | Variance | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Individual Recipient | 137.6 | 95.6 |
| State | 6.4 | 4.4 |
| **Total** | **144.0** | **100.0** |

These data suggested that 4.4 percent of the variability in average benefit duration is attributable to

state-specific factors and the remaining 95.6 percent to recipient-specific factors. Although 4.4

percent at first seems like a small amount, it is a major component of variability for a sample of EUC

recipients drawn from a small subset of states.

We explored the implications of this situation for various recipient and state sample sizes. We

found, for example, that the standard deviation of the estimate of average benefit duration made from

a simple random sample of 2,500 recipients drawn from all 51 states would be .24 (the "one-stage"

simple random sample estimate). If the sample was restricted to 15 states, the standard deviation

would be .42, a difference of 75 percent. In this example, the sample of 2,500 recipients drawn from

---

[7]The weighted state-level variance in average duration is equal to $\Sigma w_s(d_s - d_n)^2$, where $w_s$ is the state share of the population, and $d_s$ and $d_n$ are state average duration and national average duration, respectively.

15 states would provide the same statistical precision as a one-stage simple random sample of only 821 recipients (the "effective" sample size) drawn from all 51 states. Increasing the recipient sample size would do little to improve precision, because the source of the high variance is state specific, not recipient-specific. For example, doubling the sample to 5,000 recipients drawn from the same 15 states would only increase the effective sample size from 821 to 974 (an increase of 19 percent). Instead, substantially greater gains in precision could be achieved by increasing the number of states. For example, with 23 states instead of 15, a sample of 2,500 recipients has an effective size of 1,547, compared with 821 for 15 states.

On the basis of this analysis, we decided to draw our sample from 23 states and to interview 2,500 EUC recipients and 1,500 UI-only recipients. Eleven states (New York, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, New Jersey, Illinois, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, and Massachusetts), representing 64 percent of the EUC population, were selected with certainty and allocated 64 percent of our sample (see Table B.1).

The remaining noncertainty states could have been selected by a simple random drawing from the remaining states with probabilities of selection proportional to size; however, we believed additional stratification was warranted. Specifically, we chose the 12 noncertainty states on the basis of a stratified sample according to average UI benefit duration.[8] This stratification was intended to ensure adequate variability in the sample along dimensions, such as labor market strength and generosity of state UI, programs that are approximated by the average duration figures. To accomplish the stratification, the 42 noncertainty states were grouped into three equal-sized strata-- high, medium and low duration--with four states being selected from each stratum as shown in Table B.1.

---

[8]To ensure regional representativeness, we ordered states within stratum by region.

B.8

# TABLE B.1

## STATE SELECTION PROBABILITIES

| Selection Criteria | State | DOL Region | Number of EUC First Claims | Average Benefit Duration | Selection Probability 23 States | Supplementary Sample States in Initial Sample | States in Supplementary Sample |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Certainty States** | NY | 2 | 1,099,894 | 20.03 | 1 | X | |
| | CA | 9 | 1,030,755 | 16.54 | 1 | X | |
| | PA | 3 | 594,664 | 16.70 | 1 | X | |
| | TX | 6 | 528,744 | 15.17 | 1 | X | |
| | NJ | 2 | 479,865 | 18.05 | 1 | X | |
| | IL | 5 | 466,784 | 17.23 | 1 | X | |
| | FL | 4 | 464,163 | 15.02 | 1 | X | |
| | MI | 5 | 422,678 | 14.51 | 1 | X | |
| | NC | 4 | 322,288 | 10.50 | 1 | X | |
| | OH | 5 | 272,271 | 14.71 | 1 | X | |
| | MA | 1 | 252,241 | 18.95 | 1 | X | |
| **High-Duration States** | ME | 1 | 81,584 | 15.84 | 0.30 | X | |
| | VT | 1 | 20,676 | 16.14 | 0.08 | | |
| | CT | 1 | 198,648 | 16.19 | 0.73 | | X |
| | RI | 1 | 83,076 | 16.73 | 0.30 | X | |
| | WV | 3 | 55,519 | 15.12 | 0.20 | | X |
| | MD | 3 | 140,084 | 16.69 | 0.51 | | |
| | DC | 3 | 44,254 | 20.51 | 0.16 | X | |
| | MN | 5 | 110,940 | 15.65 | 0.41 | | X |
| | NM | 6 | 14,854 | 15.89 | 0.05 | | |
| | OR | 10 | 129,269 | 14.93 | 0.47 | X | |
| | AK | 10 | 43,790 | 15.33 | 0.16 | | |
| | WA | 10 | 177,344 | 16.10 | 0.65 | | X |
| **Medium-Duration States** | DE | 3 | 15,694 | 14.22 | 0.06 | | |
| | MS | 4 | 85,884 | 13.23 | 0.31 | X | |
| | KY | 4 | 90,465 | 13.71 | 0.33 | | X |
| | WI | 5 | 126,852 | 13.19 | 0.46 | X | |
| | AR | 6 | 67,191 | 12.94 | 0.25 | | |
| | OK | 6 | 60,759 | 14.36 | 0.22 | | X |
| | LA | 6 | 110,283 | 14.51 | 0.40 | X | |
| | MO | 7 | 193,860 | 14.52 | 0.71 | | X |
| | KS | 7 | 60,004 | 14.53 | 0.22 | X | |
| | MT | 8 | 22,474 | 13.80 | 0.08 | | |
| | WY | 8 | 10,047 | 14.13 | 0.04 | | |
| | HI | 9 | 30,882 | 13.00 | 0.11 | | |
| | NV | 9 | 53,816 | 14.60 | 0.20 | | X |
| | AZ | 9 | 91,442 | 14.71 | 0.33 | | |
| **Low-Duration States** | NH | 1 | 35,918 | 12.38 | 0.13 | | |
| | VA | 3 | 237,954 | 12.33 | 0.87 | X | |
| | AL | 4 | 104,671 | 11.01 | 0.38 | | X |
| | SC | 4 | 102,012 | 11.72 | 0.37 | | X |
| | GA | 4 | 154,815 | 11.73 | 0.57 | X | |
| | TN | 4 | 184,164 | 12.93 | 0.67 | X | |
| | IN | 5 | 114,853 | 11.58 | 0.42 | | X |
| | NE | 7 | 16,849 | 11.27 | 0.06 | | |
| | IA | 7 | 57,078 | 12.67 | 0.21 | | |

| Selection Criteria | State | DOL Region | Number of EUC First Claims | Average Benefit Duration | Selection Probability 23 States | Supplementary Sample States in Initial Sample | States in Supplementary Sample |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SD | 8 | 3,560 | 10.66 | 0.01 | | |
| | UT | 8 | 29,446 | 11.75 | 0.11 | | |
| | ND | 8 | 14,681 | 12.17 | 0.05 | | X |
| | CO | 8 | 66,902 | 12.47 | 0.24 | X | |
| | ID | 10 | 39,054 | 11.74 | 0.14 | | |
| **Total** | | | **9,215,995** | **15.80** | **23** | **23** | **12** |

NOTE:    EUC claims are for first payments based on regular UI, Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicemen (UCX), and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE).  The average benefit duration is for regular UI in 1991.  It is computed from data in the U.S. Department of Labor, UI Database.

ᵃThe weight is the state share of EUC claims times 51.

Finally, we decided to select, at a minimum, 10,000 EUC recipients and 10,000 UI-only recipients as the first stage of the sampling process. We intended to obtain administrative records for these samples and then select the smaller samples (2,500 EUC recipients and 1,500 UI-only recipients) for the interview. We chose 10,000 as the sample size for each of these administrative records samples to ensure that we had enough sample members to (1) complete 4,000 interviews on subsamples drawn from the latter three phases of EUC, and (2) examine the characteristics and experiences of EUC recipients by program phase.

## B. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SAMPLE DESIGN

We implemented our sample design by contacting the 23 states we selected and asking them to select random samples of recipients who either collected EUC or who began collecting UI between January 1991 and September 1993. To reduce the burden on states, we did not ask them to give us separate EUC and UI-only samples. Instead, we asked for a single sample of recipients who met either criterion (collected EUC or collected UI during the relevant period). In addition, we used data on the number of EUC and UI first payments reported by states to the Unemployment Insurance Service to set sampling rates designed to meet our target of having a minimum of 10,000 EUC and 10,000 UI only sample members. Since the EUC population was smaller than the UI-only population, and since we were conservative in setting the sampling rates, this approach meant that we ended up with administrative records samples that were larger than our minimums.

Since our sample frame covered several years, we also asked states to provide administrative data on all benefit years established during this time frame by members of this sample. When we used administrative data for our analysis, we sometimes used the individual as the unit of analysis and we sometimes used the benefit year. However, we had to decide how to handle individuals with multiple benefit years in the interviewing subsample, since the interview used the benefit year begin

date to establish a time frame for the interview which began with the pre-benefits job. One option would have been to start with the earliest benefit year. We rejected that approach, however, because we felt that our main objective of representing the EUC population was better served by sampling benefit years for the interview. Hence, we assigned individuals to the EUC subsample if they ever collected EUC, and we began the interview with the benefit year that led directly to EUC. A few individuals had more than one EUC claim during Phases 3 through 5. In these cases, we randomly selected one of these claims as the start date for the interview. We also randomly selected a benefit year to start the interview for UI-only sample members with more than one benefit year.

A relatively large number of the states we selected were not able to participate in the study because of constraints on their programming resources or for other reasons. Specifically, 10 of the 23 states we initially contacted did not participate in the study. We addressed this situation by selecting a further random sample of 12 noncertainty states; of these, 7 did not participate. We ended up with samples from 18 states.

We encountered two further difficulties in implementing our design. First, two of the states that provided samples provided them too late for inclusion in the survey. Therefore, our survey sample is drawn from 16 states. Second, because we had difficulty locating sample members (as discussed more fully in Appendix C) our survey sample is smaller than planned and not distributed by state in the same proportions as planned.

Table B.2 reports final sample sizes, by state and by sample type. Our final sample included 28,420 individuals (34,484 benefit years) for whom we collected administrative data. It also included 1,341 EUC and 963 UI-only individuals for whom we collected survey data.

TABLE B.2

EUC STUDY SAMPLE SIZES

| States | Administrative Records Sample | | Survey Samples | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Individuals | Benefit Years | EUC | UI-only |
| High-Duration | | | | |
| California | 4,945 | 5,773 | 141 | 146 |
| Connecticut | 2,313 | 2,612 | n.a. | n.a. |
| District of Columbia | 521 | 581 | 38 | 19 |
| Florida | 1,566 | 1,840 | 87 | 42 |
| Illinois | 1,546 | 1,917 | 68 | 34 |
| Maine | 443 | 580 | 67 | 37 |
| Minnesota | 1,683 | 2,203 | 121 | 92 |
| New Jersey | 3,393 | 4,423 | 76 | 27 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,098 | 2,733 | 144 | 84 |
| Texas | 1,406 | 1,619 | 137 | 37 |
| West Virginia | 1,201 | 1,514 | 77 | 70 |
| Medium-Duration States | | | | |
| Kentucky | 1,534 | 1,691 | 93 | 71 |
| Louisiana | 664 | 902 | n.a. | n.a. |
| Oklahoma | 893 | 1,013 | 63 | 40 |
| Wisconsin | 1,781 | 2,111 | 86 | 123 |
| Low-Duration States | | | | |
| Georgia | 944 | 1,130 | 38 | 73 |
| North Carolina | 984 | 1,227 | 59 | 26 |
| Tennessee | 505 | 615 | 46 | 42 |
| **Total** | **28,420** | **34,484** | **1,341** | **963** |

n.a. = not applicable--sample received too late for inclusion in survey.

## C. WEIGHTS

We constructed weights for the administrative records and survey samples to produce nationally representative estimates. For the administrative records sample, the weights were designed to produce national estimates of the population of individuals receiving UI and/or EUC during the EUC period and national estimates of the benefit years established during that period. For the survey samples, the weights were designed to produce national estimates of the EUC Phase 3 through 5 population and national estimates of the UI-only population receiving UI during that period.

The major problem we faced in constructing these weights was that we had fewer (and, sometimes, different) states in the final sample than planned.[9] We addressed this problem by using external data on state-level UI and EUC activities reported by states to the Unemployment Insurance Service to compute national estimates of key EUC and UI program outcomes. In making these estimates, we treated each program separately; however, since most individuals who collected EUC also collected UI, we also computed estimates of key outcomes for the combined population (that is, individuals who collected under either program). We used data from our records samples to estimate the proportion of EUC recipients who did not begin collecting UI between January 1991 and September 1993.[10] We used the proportion for each state in our sample and the average for other states to compute the number of EUC first payments to individuals who did not collect UI. We then added this number to the number of UI first payments to compute the number of EUC and/or UI first payments made during our observation period. This unduplicated count of first payments was

---

[9]The distribution of sample members by state was also different than planned but this did not present a major problem. We had random samples of recipients in each state in our records samples, and, although there was some nonresponse to the survey, we treated the survey samples in each state as simple random samples when constructing weights. We examine the appropriateness of this assumption in Appendix C.

[10]These are the reachback and EUC option claims.

divided into the number of weeks compensated and total payments under the two programs to produce our national EUC/UI estimates.

Using these estimates of national figures, we examined two alternative ways of weighting the state samples. Under the first alternative, we weighted the 18 states in the records sample to represent themselves. That is, we assigned weights such that the California sample represented California, the Connecticut sample represented Connecticut, and so on. This is a conservative approach that says that the sample only represents the 55 percent of the population found in the sampled states.

Under the second alternative, we weighted the 18 states in the records sample to represent the national population. We did this by grouping certainty and noncertainty states by stratum and adjusting the initial weight (the share of the total population represented by a state) assigned to each state to account for any nonresponse in the stratum. For example, we initially selected eight certainty and four noncertainty states in the high duration stratum but we ended up with six certainty and five noncertainty states whose weights, when summed, implied that this stratum equaled 54 percent of the EUC population. Since the high-duration states actually contained 65 percent of the EUC population, we increased each state weight to sum to 65 percent.

Our comparison of these weighting schemes (see Table B.3) indicated that either approach would produce estimates that appear close to our national estimates for the EUC population, the UI population, or the combined EUC/UI population. However, since the weights designed to represent the national population produced estimates closer to our national estimates, and since we would like to characterize our estimates as representing the nation, we chose to use the national weights in our analysis.

# TABLE B.3

## COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE
## WEIGHTING SCHEMES

| | | Weighting Alternative | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | National Estimate | Weight States to Represent States in Sample | Weight States to Represent All States |
| **EUC** | | | |
| Average Weeks Compensated | 17.6 | 18.5 | 17.5 |
| Average Payments | $3,080 | $3,152 | $2,916 |
| Exhaustion Rate | 54.5 | 57.9 | 55.3 |
| **UI** | | | |
| Average Weeks Compensated | 16.0 | 16.3 | 15.8 |
| Average Payments | $2,704 | $2,693 | $2,556 |
| Exhaustion Rate | 38.2 | 40.2 | 38.2 |
| **EUC/UI** | | | |
| Average Weeks Compensated | 21.0 | 21.6 | 20.6 |
| Average Payments | $3,620 | $3,599 | $3,373 |
| Exhaustion Rate | N.A. | 18.6 | 18.7 |

N.A. = not available.

We then computed weights for our records and survey samples designed to make these samples representative of the national populations of EUC and UI recipients. We created one weight for the records sample and two weights for the survey samples (see Table B.4). More specifically for the records sample, we created weights that when multiplied by the individuals or benefit years in the sample sum respectively to the total number of individuals who collected UI and /or EUC during the EUC period and that sum to the total number of benefit years established during this period. As noted previously, we defined the EUC period as including all individuals who received an EUC first payment and all individuals who received a UI first payment between January 1991 and September 1993 and did not collect EUC. As described above, we used data from our records samples to estimate the proportion of EUC first payments to recipients who did not also begin collecting UI between January 1991 and September 1993. We then used these figures to compute unduplicated counts of benefit years established during the EUC period. Finally, we used these numbers to adjust our initial sample weights by stratum, as described earlier. The resulting weights are applicable to individuals or benefit years included in our sample.

We used an analogous procedure for the survey samples to create weights for the EUC and UI-only samples that sum to national totals of EUC recipients who began collecting EUC during Phases 3 through 5 and UI-only recipients who began receiving UI between January 1992 and September 1993.

## C. DESIGN EFFECTS

The standard errors produced by most statistical programs are computed under the assumption that the samples used to compute estimates are simple random samples of the population. However, as we discussed previously, these standard errors underestimate the true standard errors for estimates

# TABLE B.4

## EUC STUDY SAMPLE WEIGHTS

| States | Records Sample | Survey Samples | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | EUC | UI-only |
| **High-Duration** | | | |
| California | 801 | 5,997 | 14,559 |
| Connecticut | 363 | n.a. | n.a. |
| District of Columbia | 1,630 | 6,281 | 19,443 |
| Florida | 647 | 4,359 | 8,841 |
| Illinois | 705 | 5,277 | 14,862 |
| Maine | 1,633 | 3,562 | 9,984 |
| Minnesota | 430 | 1,973 | 4,015 |
| New Jersey | 256 | 4,916 | 13,175 |
| Pennsylvania | 628 | 3,690 | 7,058 |
| Texas | 900 | 3,225 | 14,972 |
| West Virginia | 626 | 3,100 | 5,277 |
| | | | |
| **Medium-Duration States** | | | |
| Kentucky | 898 | 4,298 | 11,821 |
| Louisiana | 1,683 | n.a. | n.a. |
| Oklahoma | 1,498 | 6,344 | 20,982 |
| Wisconsin | 719 | 4,647 | 6,823 |
| | | | |
| **Low-Duration States** | | | |
| Georgia | 1,549 | 8,422 | 10,076 |
| North Carolina | 1,147 | 7,404 | 15,141 |
| Tennessee | 2,846 | 6,957 | 17,512 |

n.a. = not applicable--sample received too late for inclusion in survey.

made with our samples, since they are not simple random samples of the national population. Instead, our samples are clustered by state, and this clustering increases standard errors.

We examined the degree to which simple random sample standard errors should be increased to account for the sample design. We computed these design effects using the SUDAAN computer program, which was developed at the Research Triangle Institute.[11] This program uses Taylor Series approximations to compute estimated variances using standard formulas that relate the size of the design effect to the relative size of two variables: (1) the component of the variance due to variation within individual clusters in the survey design, and (2) the component of variance due to differences between clusters in the relevant underlying population characteristics.

Since we examine a number of characteristics of sample members, and since the size of the design effect varies by characteristic, we computed design effects for a number of variables. Table B.5 shows the results of this exercise. These estimates range from a low, negligible effect of 1.02 for the percent female in the EUC sample to a high of 2.32 for the percent white. This range is not surprising, since the proportion of the UI population that is female is unlikely to vary among states (clusters in our sample) as much as the proportion that is white. Other important variables, such as the mean weekly benefit amounts and mean weeks on UI and EUC, which are likely to vary by state given differences in state laws and economic conditions, have design effects in the mid to high end of this range.

---

[11]We report design effects computed as the proportional change in the standard error due to the survey design as compared to the standard error that could be achieved by a simple random sample of the same size, although design effects are often reported as the proportional change in the variance due to the survey design.

TABLE B.5

DESIGN EFFECTS: SURVEY SAMPLES

| Characteristic | EUC Sample | | | UI-only Sample | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Standard Error | Design Effect | Mean | Standard Error | Design Effect |
| **Demographic Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Percent Female | 43.8 | 1.4 | 1.02 | 40.8 | 2.5 | 1.59 |
| Percent White | 69.7 | 2.9 | 2.32 | 74.0 | 3.3 | 2.31 |
| Mean Age | 40.6 | 3.4 | 1.03 | 38.4 | 4.0 | 1.05 |
| **Pre-UC Labor Market Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Percent Pre-UC Job in Manufacturing | 32.6 | 2.0 | 1.57 | 33.2 | 2.3 | 1.51 |
| Percent Expect Recall | 28.3 | 1.8 | 1.45 | 38.1 | 1.8 | 1.96 |
| **UC Experiences** | | | | | | |
| Mean Weekly Benefit Amount | $180 | 3.7 | 2.02 | $177 | 5.0 | 2.28 |
| Mean Weeks UI | 22.0 | .4 | 2.19 | 11.9 | 5.1 | 1.80 |
| Mean Weeks EUC | 14.1 | .3 | 1.31 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Percent Exhausted EUC | 60.0 | 2.1 | 1.49 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a |
| **Labor Market Outcomes (if Reemployed)** | | | | | | |
| Mean Months Until First Job | 13.2 | .4 | 1.12 | 6.9 | .4 | 1.07 |
| Ratio of First Job Weekly Wage to Pre-UC Weekly Wage | .9 | .02 | 1.04 | 1.0 | .02 | 1.02 |
| | 1,341 | | | 963 | | |

SOURCE:  Emergency Unemployment Compensation Survey.

NOTE:  The design effects were computed using the SUDAAN program developed by Research Triangle Institute. While design effects are usually shown as the effect of the simple design on the variance, we report the effects on the standard error of the estimate.

Given this range in design effects, we chose to use the average (1.6) as a rough design effect to apply to our survey results. That is, when making comparisons between the EUC and UI samples, we inflated standard errors by 1.6 when determining which differences were statistically significant.

Table B.6 provides standard errors for the survey samples for binary variables used to estimate the prevalence of characteristics that can be expressed as a proportion or percent (for example, the percent expecting recall). These standard errors can be used to compute confidence intervals for such characteristics or to compute standard errors for difference of means tests. For example, we reported in Table III.6 that 23 percent of the UI-and-EUC sample expected recall by their pre-UI employer as compared to 49 percent for the EUC-only sample. Two-tailed 95 percent confidence intervals for these estimates would equal 1.96 times the appropriate standard error from Table III.6, which would be approximately +/-4 percent for the UI-and-EUC sample. The t-statistic for a difference of means test equals the difference between a characteristic for two groups divided by the standard error of the difference of means, which equals the square root of the sum of the variances of the two estimates. For example, the t-statistic for the difference in the expected recall rate for the UI-and-EUC and the EUC-only sample is 5.1 $\left[ (49-23)/\sqrt{(4.6^2+2.3^2)} \right]$. This level indicates that the difference is statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level for a two-tailed test.

## TABLE B.6

### STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTS
### EUC SURVEY

| Characteristic Percent | EUC-UI | EUC-Only | UI-Only |
|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | 2.5 | 4.6 | 2.6 |
| 40 (60) | 2.4 | 4.5 | 2.5 |
| 30 (70) | 2.3 | 4.2 | 2.4 |
| 20 (80) | 2.0 | 3.7 | 2.1 |
| 10 (90) | 1.5 | 2.8 | 1.5 |

NOTE: The standard errors were computed using the formula $1.6 \sqrt{p(1-p)/n}$ where p is the percent of the population with a characteristic, and n is the sample size for the EUC-UI, EUC-only, or UI-only sample. The 1.6 factor is used to inflate the standard errors to account for design effects.

# APPENDIX C

# SURVEY RESULTS AND NONRESPONSE BIAS ANALYSIS

The EUC study design called for the selection of nationally representative samples of Unemployment Compensation (UC) recipients and the collection of Unemployment Insurance (UI) program data and, for a subsample, telephone survey data on the pre-layoff characteristics of recipients and their post-layoff labor market experiences. We implemented this design using a two-step process involving the random selection of states and the random selection of UC recipients in those states. Initially we selected 23 states for the sample, but, as discussed in Appendix A, not all states agreed to participate. In the end, 18 states provided data, with 16 doing so in time for inclusion in the survey. We then selected subsamples of EUC recipients and UI recipients who did not collect EUC (called the "UI-only sample") for the telephone survey. The EUC sample was chosen to represent individuals who began receiving EUC in July 1992 or later (that is, in EUC, Phases 3 through 5). The UI-only sample was chosen to represent individuals who began receiving UI during the period January 1992 through September 1993. These individuals would have collected EUC during the same time period as the EUC sample if they had continued onto EUC. The survey subsamples were restricted in this way to help minimize recall error. Even with this restriction, however, the recall period was long. The interviews were conducted between April 1996 and April 1997, which, on average, was three and a half years after the respondents' UC first payments.

This appendix provides information on the survey results, the number of completions, their distribution by state, and the reasons for nonresponse. It uses administrative records data to examine nonresponse and to assess the likelihood that survey results could be biased because of nonresponse to the survey.[1]

---

[1]Another source of nonresponse that could affect our findings is nonresponse among the states selected for the survey. We address that issue in Appendix A.

## A. SURVEY RESULTS

We attempted interviews with 4,781 sample members and completed interviews with 2,304, yielding an overall response rate of 48 percent (Table C.1). This response rate varied slightly by sample; it was 46 percent for the EUC sample and 52 percent for the UI-only sample. It also varied by state as has been our experience in other, similar studies. It was highest in Minnesota and Wisconsin (just over 60 percent) and lowest in California and Texas (40 percent).

The overall response rate and the rates in each state were low, both in an absolute sense and in comparison to the rates achieved in prior surveys of UI recipients. For example, Corson and Dynarski (1990) report an overall response rate of 60 percent in their study of UI exhaustees. Response rates for states included in both studies were as much as 20 percentage points higher in the earlier survey.

Several reasons exist for the low response rate achieved in this study. The most important one is that it was difficult to locate sample members. As Table C.2 shows, 32 percent of the cases were not located (60 percent of the nonrespondents). The interview was conducted approximately three and a half years after the UC first payment was made, and the addresses and telephone numbers available from UC records were old. Having old, out-of-date addresses contributed to the difficulty we encountered in locating sample members; but, interestingly, 31 percent of the sample members in the exhaustee study also were not located, and the addresses in that study were, on average, only 20 months old.

Another factor contributing to the low response rate is that some individuals either did not complete the full interview (2 percent) or refused to be interviewed (10 percent). In this case, the experience in the exhaustee study was different; there were virtually no partial completes and the refusal rate was half that of this study. One possible reason for this difference is that this interview

## TABLE C.1

### EUC SURVEY: NUMBER OF COMPLETES AND COMPLETION RATES, BY STATE

| State | EUC | | UI-Only | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| California | 141 | 39.6 | 146 | 40.6 | 287 | 40.1 |
| District of Columbia | 38 | 38.4 | 19 | 61.3 | 57 | 43.8 |
| Florida | 87 | 38.5 | 42 | 48.8 | 129 | 41.3 |
| Georgia | 38 | 38.0 | 73 | 49.3 | 111 | 44.8 |
| Illinois | 68 | 42.5 | 34 | 42.5 | 102 | 42.5 |
| Kentucky | 93 | 51.7 | 71 | 46.7 | 164 | 49.4 |
| Maine | 67 | 52.8 | 37 | 62.7 | 104 | 55.9 |
| Minnesota | 121 | 63.0 | 92 | 63.0 | 213 | 63.0 |
| North Carolina | 59 | 49.6 | 26 | 53.1 | 85 | 50.6 |
| New Jersey | 76 | 40.6 | 27 | 46.6 | 103 | 42.0 |
| Oklahoma | 63 | 41.4 | 40 | 47.6 | 103 | 43.6 |
| Pennsylvania | 144 | 53.3 | 84 | 56.4 | 228 | 54.4 |
| Tennessee | 46 | 46.5 | 42 | 59.2 | 88 | 51.8 |
| Texas | 137 | 38.5 | 37 | 45.1 | 174 | 39.7 |
| Wisconsin | 86 | 62.8 | 123 | 61.5 | 209 | 62.0 |
| West Virginia | 77 | 50.7 | 70 | 61.4 | 147 | 55.3 |
| **Total** | **1,341** | **46.1** | **963** | **51.5** | **2,304** | **48.5** |

# TABLE C.2

## EUC SURVEY OUTCOMES

| Interview Outcome | Percent |
|---|---|
| Completion | 48.2 |
| Partial Completion | 2.3 |
| Refusal | 10.0 |
| Could Not Locate | 31.8 |
| Case Retired | 5.7 |
| Other | 2.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |
| **Total Cases Released** | **4,781** |

was longer (it averaged 45 minutes) than the earlier interview (which averaged about 30 minutes). The interview length contributed to the partial completes, since some individuals refused to continue with the interview. Length may also have contributed to the refusals, since individuals were told approximately how long the interview was when they were asked to participate.

Finally, some cases (about six percent) were retired because we made multiple phone calls without reaching the potential respondent or for other reasons such as ill health, language barriers, or death (two percent).

## B. POTENTIAL NONRESPONSE BIAS

Results of the survey could be affected by nonresponse bias, particularly since the overall completion rate was quite low. If nonrespondents differ from respondents in a systematic way, inferences drawn from the interview data on the characteristics and labor market experiences of respondents could be misleading and not representative of the universe of UC recipients.

To analyze the implications of survey nonresponse for the analysis, we used UC administrative data that were available for both respondents and nonrespondents to explore differences in the baseline characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents and in UC outcomes. To perform this analysis, we used the weights described in Appendix A to create estimates for the respondent sample, which can be characterized as nationally representative of the UC population. We created comparable weights for nonrespondents, so that the weighted distribution of nonrespondents matched the weighted distribution of respondents by state and UC status (EUC and UI-only). This step was necessary because response rates differed by state and by UC status.

Our analysis shows (Table C.3) that there were a number of statistically significant differences between respondents and nonrespondents. Survey respondents were more likely than nonrespondents to be female, older, and nonminority. Respondents also had higher base period

## TABLE C.3

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SURVEY RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS

|  | Survey Respondents | Survey Nonrespondents | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Pre-Layoff Characteristics** | | | |
| Female (Percent) | 41.7 | 37.9** | 39.8 |
| Mean Age | 39.3 | 37.2*** | 38.3 |
| Race/Ethnicity[a] | | | |
| Caucasian (percent) | 74.1 | 67.8*** | 71.0 |
| African American (percent) | 12.2 | 15.5*** | 13.9 |
| Hispanic (percent) | 9.8 | 12.2*** | 11.0 |
| Other race/ethnicity (percent) | 3.9 | 4.4*** | 4.1 |
| In Manufacturing (Percent) | 29.6 | 28.4 | 29.0 |
| Base Period Earnings | 18,568 | 16,568*** | 17,581 |
| **UI and EUC Experience** | | | |
| UI Maximum Benefit Amount (Dollars) | 4,347 | 4,026*** | 4,187 |
| UI Weekly Benefit Amount (Dollars) | 179 | 169*** | 174 |
| Weeks of Potential UI Duration | 24.0 | 23.5*** | 23.8 |
| UI Collected (Dollars) | 2,768 | 2,578** | 2,673 |
| Weeks UI Collected | 15.4 | 14.9 | 15.1 |
| Exhausted UI (Percent) | 40.5 | 42.5 | 41.5 |
| EUC Maximum Benefit Amount (Dollars) | 3,357 | 3,296 | 3,326 |
| EUC Weekly Benefit Amount (Dollars) | 180 | 176 | 178 |
| Weeks of Potential EUC Duration | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.6 |

C.8

TABLE C.3 *(continued)*

|  | Survey Respondents | Survey Nonrespondents | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| EUC Collected (Dollars) | 2,574 | 2,547 | 2,560 |
| Weeks EUC Collected | 14.1 | 14.5 | 14.3 |
| Exhausted EUC (Percent) | 21.8 | 23.0 | 22.4 |
| Percent of EUC Claimants Who Collected EUC First[b] | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.9 |
| **Unweighted Sample Size** | **2,304** | **2,477** | **4,781** |

SOURCE: Weighted administrative records and survey data.

NOTE: Statistics for either the UI or the EUC program pertain only to those claimants who participated in that program.

[a]A chi-squared statistic was used to test the hypothesis that the racial distribution of survey respondents is the same as the distribution of survey nonrespondents.

[b]Claimants collecting EUC first include both claimants who subsequently collected UI and those that did not.

*Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, two-tailed test.
**Significantly different from zero at the .05 level, two-tailed test.
***Significantly different from zero at the .01 level, two-tailed test.

earnings--hence, higher average weekly benefit amounts and entitlements for the regular UI program. They also collected more dollars of UI, but differences in other UI outcomes (weeks collected and the exhaustion rate) were not statistically significant. This pattern of differences between respondents and nonrespondents suggests that the respondent sample represented an older, more stable population than the nonrespondent sample--which is not surprising, given that the main reason for nonresponse was an inability to locate a sample member.

Although we find statistically significant differences between respondents and nonrespondents, we think that the broad conclusions drawn from the survey data in this report are not affected substantially by nonresponse. There are two reasons for this conclusion. First, the main focus of this report is on describing EUC experiences. While we found some differences in UI program entitlements and collections, we did not find statistically significant differences for EUC program variables. Respondents and nonrespondents had similar EUC weekly benefit amounts and entitlements, and there were no significant differences in EUC outcomes--dollars collected, weeks collected, exhaustion rate, or likelihood of choosing the option to collect EUC instead of UI.

Second, most of the differences we found are small (although statistically significant). For example, the respondent-nonrespondent difference in UI potential weeks is one-half week, and the difference in the UI weekly benefit amount is $10. Because the completion rate was roughly 50 percent, the nonresponse adjusted estimate differs from the survey estimate by half these amounts. Similarly, the differences in baseline characteristics seem small. For example, mean age differs from the nonresponse adjusted estimate by one year, and the percent female differs by two percentage points. Even the estimates for race/ethnicity differ at most by three percentage points. These differences seem small; as stated earlier, we think the broad conclusions we reach using the survey data are unaffected by nonresponse.

# UI OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

The Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper Series presents
research findings and analyses dealing with unemployment
insurance issues.  Papers are prepared by research contractors,
staff members of the unemployment insurance system, or individual
researchers.  Manuscripts and comments from interested
individuals are welcomed.  All correspondence should be sent to:

> UI Occasional Papers Series
> U.S. Department of Labor
> Unemployment Insurance Service
> Employment and Training Administration
> 200 Constitution Avenue, NW  Room C-4512
> Washington, D.C. 20210
> Attention: Wayne Gordon

Arrangements have been made for the sale of most of the reports
in the series through a Federal information and retrieval system,
at the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).  Copies of
the reports are available from NTIS in paper or microfiche.  The
NTIS accession number for the paper copy is listed after the
title of each paper.  To obtain the papers from NTIS, forward
orders to:

> National Technical Information Service
> U.S. Department of Commerce
> 5285 Port Royal Road
> Springfield, Virginia  22161
> Telephone:  (703) 487-4600

Papers which are not available are indicated with an asterisk.

1977

G. Joachim Elterich and Linda Graham,                          77-1
Impact of Extension of Coverage to
Agricultural Workers Under P.L. 94-566,
Their Characteristics and Economic Welfare,
University of Delaware.
NTIS PB83-147819.


G. Joachim Elterich and Linda Graham,                          77-2
Impact of P.L. 94-566 on Agricultural
Employers and Unemployment Insurance
Trust Funds in Selected States,
University of Delaware.
NTIS PB83-147827.


David Stevens, Unemployment Insurance                          77-3
Beneficiary Job Search Behavior:  What
Is Known and What Should Be Known for
Administrative Planning Purposes,
University of Missouri.


Michael Klausner, Unemployment Insurance                       77-4
and the Work Disincentive Effect:  An
Examination of Recent Research,
Unemployment Insurance Service.


Gary Solon, Weekly Benefit Amounts and                         77-5
Normal Weekly Wages of Unemployment
Insurance Claimants, Unemployment
Insurance Service.


Ruth Entes, Family Support and Expenditures                    77-6
Survey of Unemployment Insurance Claimants
in New York State, September 1972-February
1974, New York State Department of Labor.

Saul Blaustein and Paul Mackin                              77-7
<u>Development of the Weekly Benefit Amount in</u>
<u>Unemployment Insurance</u>, Upjohn Institute.


Saul Blaustein and Paul Mackin, <u>Job Loss</u>,            77-8
<u>Family Living Standards, and the Adequacy of</u>
<u>Weekly Unemployment Benefits</u>, Upjohn Institute


                            <u>1978</u>


Henry Felder and Richard West, <u>The Federal</u>           78-1
<u>Supplemental Benefits Program: National</u>
<u>Experience and the Impact of P.L. 95-19</u>, SRI
International.
NTIS PB83-149633.


Paul Burgess, Jerry Kingston and Chris Walters,            78-2
<u>The Adequacy of Unemployment Insurance Benefits:</u>
<u>An Analysis of Weekly Benefits Relative to</u>
<u>Preunemployment Expenditure Levels</u>, Arizona
Department of Economic Security and Arizona
State University.
NTIS PB83-148528.


Christopher Pleatsikas, Lawrence Bailis and                78-3
Judith Dernburg, <u>A Study of Measures of</u>
<u>Substantial Attachment to the Labor Force</u>,
Volumes I and II, Urban Systems Research and
Engineering, Inc.
Vol I: NTlS  PB83-147561.
Vol. II:  NTIS PB83-147579.


Henry Felder and Randall Pozdena, The Federal              78-4
<u>Supplemental Benefits Program:  Impact of</u>
<u>P.L. 95-19 on Individual Recipients</u>, SRI
International.
NTIS PB83-149179.

Peter Kauffman, Margaret Kauffman, Michael          78-5
Werner and Christine Jennison, An Analysis of
Some of the Effects of Increasing the Duration
of Regular Unemployment Insurance Benefits,
Management Engineers, Inc.


Jerry Kingston, Paul Burgess and Chris Walters,    78-6
The Adequacy of Unemployment Insurance Benefits:
An Analysis of Adjustments Undertaken Through
Thirteen and Twenty-Five Weeks of Unemployment,
Arizona Department of Economic Security and
Arizona State University.
NTIS PB83-149823.


Walter Nicholson and Walter Corson, The Effect     78-7
of State Laws and Economic Factors on Exhaustion
Rates for Regular Unemployment Insurance Benefits:
A Statistical Model, Mathematica Policy Research.
NTIS PB83-149468.


Louis Benenson, Incidence of Federal Retirees      78-8
Drawing UCFE Benefits, 1974-75, Unemployment
Insurance Service.
NTIS PB83-161927.



                        1979



Henry Felder, A Statistical Evaluation of the      79-1
Impact of Disqualification Provisions of State
Unemployment Insurance Laws. SRI International.
NTIS PB83-152272.


Arthur Denzau, Ronald Oaxaca and Carol Taylor,     79-2
The Impact of Unemployment Insurance Benefits
on Local Economies--Tucson, University of
Arizona.
NTIS PB83-169912.

Paul Burgess, Jerry Kingston and the Research                    79-3
and Reports Section of the Unemployment Insurance
Bureau, Arizona Department of Economic Security,
Labor Market Experiences of Unemployment
Insurance Exhaustees, Arizona Department of
Economic Security and Arizona State University.
NTIS PB83-224162.


Carolyn Sperber, An Evaluation of Current and                    79-4
Alternative Methods of Determining Exhaustion
Ratios, Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB83-148866.


Mamoru Ishikawa, Unemployment Compensation in                    79-5
Varying Phases of Joblessness, Unemployment
Insurance Service.
NTIS PB83-150581.


Nicholas Kiefer and George Neumann, The Effect                   79-6
of Alternative Partial Benefit Formulas on
Beneficiary Part-Time Work Behavior, National
Opinion Research Center.
NTIS PB83-146811.



                              1980



Mamoru Iskikawa, Unemployment Insurance and                      80-1
Proliferation of Other Income Protection Programs
for Experienced Workers, Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB83-140657.


UI Research Exchange. Information on                              80-2
unemployment insurance research. First issue: 1980,
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB83-148411.

Raymond P.F. Fishe and G.S. Maddala, <u>Effect of</u>                    80-3
<u>Unemployment Insurance on Duration of Unemployment:</u>
<u>A Study Based on CWBH Data for Florida</u>,
Florida State University and University of Florida.
PB88-162464.


Jerry Kingston, Paul Burgess, Robert St. Louis                         80-4
and Joseph Sloane, <u>Benefit Adequacy and UI Program</u>
<u>Costs:  Simulations with Alternative Weekly Benefit</u>
<u>Formulas</u>, Arizona Department of Economic Security
and Arizona State University.



<u>1981</u>


<u>UI Research Exchange</u>.   Information on unemployment              81-1
insurance research.   First issue:   1981.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB83-152587.


Jerry Kingston, Paul Burgess, Robert St. Louis and                     81-2
Joseph Sloane, <u>Can Benefit Adequacy Be Predicted</u>
<u>on the Basis of UI Claims and CWBH Data?</u>  Arizona
Department of Economic Security and Arizona State
University.
NTIS PB83-140566.


Paul Burgess, Jerry Kingston, Robert St. Louis and                     81-3
Joseph Sloane, <u>Changes in Spending Patterns</u>
<u>Following Unemployment</u>, Arizona Department of
Economic Security and Arizona State University.
NTIS PB83-148833.


<u>UI Research Exchange</u>.  Information on unemployment               81-4
insurance research.   Second issue:   1981,
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB83-148429.

## 1983

Walter Corson and Walter Nicholson, <u>An Analysis of</u>                    83-1
<u>UI Recipients' Unemployment Spells</u>, Mathematica
Policy Research.
NTIS PB84-151463.


Lois Blanchard and Walter Corson, <u>A Guide to the</u>                     83-2
<u>Analysis of UI Recipients' Unemployment Spells Using</u>
<u>a Supplemented CWBH Data Set</u>, Mathematica Policy
Research.
NTIS PB84-151471.


Ronald L. Oaxaca and Carol A. Taylor, <u>The Effects</u>                    83-3
<u>of Aggregate Unemployment Insurance Benefits in the</u>
<u>U.S. on the Operation of a Local Economy</u>, University
of Arizona.
NTIS PB84-150317.


<u>UI Research Exchange</u>.   Information on unemployment           83-4
insurance research.   1983 issue.   Unemployment
Insurance Service.
NTIS PB84-150325.

## 1984

<u>UI Research Exchange</u>.   Information on unemployment           84-1
insurance research.   1984 issue.   Unemployment
Insurance Service.
NTIS PB85-180370.


Stephen Wandner, John Robinson and Helen Manheimer         84-2
<u>Unemployment Insurance Schemes in Developing</u>
<u>Countries</u>, Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB85-185098/AS.

## 1985

Walter Corson and Walter Nicholson, <u>An Analysis of</u>          85-1
<u>the 1981-82 Changes in the Extended Benefit Program</u>,
Mathematica Policy Research.
NTIS PB85-176287/AS.


Walter Corson, David Long and Walter Nicholson,              85-2
<u>Evaluation of the Charleston Claimant Placement and</u>
<u>Work Test Demonstration</u>, Mathematica Policy Research.
NTIS PB85-152965.


Walter Corson, Alan Hershey, Stuart Kerachsky,               85-3
Paul Rynders and John Wichita, <u>Application of</u>
<u>the Unemployment Insurance System Work Test and</u>
<u>Nonmonetary Eligibility Standards</u>, Mathematica Policy
Research.
NTIS PB85-169910/AS.


Robert Moffitt, <u>The Effect of the Duration of</u>              85-4
<u>Unemployment Benefits on Work Incentives:  An</u>
<u>Analysis of Four Data Sets</u>, Mathematica Policy
Research.
NTIS PB85-170546.


Helen Manheimer and Evangeline Cooper, <u>Beginning</u>          85-5
<u>the Unemployment Insurance Program--An Oral History</u>,
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB87-117370/AS.

## 1986

Helen Manheimer, John Robinson, Norman Harvey,               86-1
William Sheehan and Burman Skrable, <u>Alternative</u>
<u>Uses of Unemployment Insurance</u>, Unemployment
Insurance Service.
NTIS PB87-118402/AS.

Norman Harvey, <u>Unemployment Insurance Bibliography</u>,          86-2
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB87-118410/AS.


Walter Corson, Jean Grossman and Walter Nicholson,          86-3
<u>An Evaluation of the Federal Supplemental</u>
<u>Compensation Program</u>, Mathematica Policy Research.
NTIS PB86-163144.


Stuart Kerachsky, Walter Nicholson and Alan Hershey,          86-4
<u>An Evaluation of Short-Time Compensation Programs</u>,
Mathematica Policy Research.
NTIS PB86-167616.


James M. Rosbrow, <u>Fifty Years of Unemployment</u>          86-5
<u>Insurance--A Legislative History: 1935-1985</u>,
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB87-179834/AS.


Stephen A. Wandner, (editor) <u>Measuring Structural</u>          86-6
<u>Unemployment</u>, Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB87-209433/AS.


<u>1987</u>


Burt Barnow and Wayne Vroman, <u>An Analysis of UI</u>          87-1
<u>Trust Fund Adequacy</u>, Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB87-209342.


Esther Johnson, <u>Short-Time Compensation: A Handbook</u>          87-2
<u>Basic Source Material</u>, Unemployment Insurance Service
NTIS PB88-163589.

## 1988

Walter Corson, Stuart Kerachsky and Ellen Eliason        88-1
Kisker, Work Search Among Unemployment Insurance
Claimants: An Investigation of Some Effects of
State Rules and Enforcement. Mathematica Policy
Research.
NTIS PB89-160022/AS.


UI Research Exchange. Information on unemployment      88-2
insurance research. 1988 issue. Unemployment
Insurance Service.
NTIS PB89-160030/AS.


Walter Corson and Walter Nicholson, An Examination    88-3
of Declining UI Claims During the 1980s.
Mathematica Policy Research.
NTIS PB89-160048/AS.


Phillip Richardson, Albert Irion, Arlen Rosenthal     88-4
and Harold Kuptzin, Referral of Long-Term
Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants to
Reemployment Services. First Edition. Macro
Systems and Mathematica Policy Research.
REPLACED BY REVISED VERSION OF UI OCCASIONAL PAPER 89-2.


## 1989

Walter Corson, Walter Nicholson and Stuart            89-1
Kerachsky, The Secretary's Seminars on
Unemployment Insurance. Mathematica Policy
Research.
NTIS PB90-216649.


Phillip Richardson, Albert Irion, Arlen Rosenthal     89-2
and Harold Kuptzin, Referral of Long-Term
Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants to
Reemployment Services. Revised Edition.
Systems and Mathematica Policy Research.
NTIS PB89-153100/AS.

Walter Corson, Shari Dunstan, Paul  Decker,                89-3
and Anne Gordon, New Jersey Unemployment Insurance
Reemployment Demonstration Project.
Mathematic Policy Research.
NTIS PB90-216714.


UI Research Exchange.   Information on unemployment        89-4
insurance research.   1989 issue.   Unemployment
Insurance Service.
NTIS PB90-114125/AS.


John L. Czajka, Sharon L. Long, and Walter Nicholson,     89-5
An Evaluation of the Feasibility of a Substate Area
Extended Benefit Program.  Mathematic Policy Research.
NTIS PB90-127531/AS.


Wayne Vroman, Experience Rating in Unemployment           89-6
Insurance:  Some Current Issues.   The Urban Institute.
NTIS  PB90-216656.


Jack Bright, Leadership in Appellate Administration:      89-7
Successful State Unemployment Insurance Appellate
Operations.  Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB90-161183/AS.


                         1990


Geoffrey L. Hopwood, Kansas Nonmonetary Expert           90-1
System Prototype.   Evaluation Research Corporation
NTIS PB90-232711.


Esther R. Johnson, Reemployment Services To              90-2
Unemployed Workers Having Difficulty Becoming
Reemployed.  Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB91-106849.

Walter Corson, and Mark Dynarski, <u>A Study of</u>                90-3
<u>Unemployment Insurance Recipients and Exhaustees:</u>
<u>Findings from a National Survey</u>.  Mathematica Policy
Research, Inc.
NTIS PB91-129247.


<u>UI Research Exchange</u>.   Information on unemployment          90-4
insurance research.  1990 issue.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB91-153171.


                              <u>1991</u>


Patricia Anderson, Walter Corson, and Paul Decker,               91-1
<u>The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment</u>
<u>Demonstration Project  Follow-Up Report</u>.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
NTIS PB91-160838/AS.


Wayne Vroman, <u>The Decline In Unemployment Insurance</u>          91-2
<u>Claims Activity in the 1980s</u>.   The Urban Institute.
NTIS PB91-160994/AS.

     NOTE:   A public use data tape also is
     available from the Bureau of the Census. To
     obtain the tape contact Customer Services,
     Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233
     or telephone 301-763-4100; when requesting
     the public use tape cite:  Current Population
     Survey, Unemployment Compensation Benefits:
     May, August and November 1989 and February
     1990 (machine readable data file) conducted
     by the Bureau of the Census for the Employment
     and Training Administration, U.S. Department
     of Labor, Washington:  Bureau of the Census
     (producer and distributor), 1990.


Bruce H. Dunson, S. Charles Maurice, and Gerald P.               91-3
Dwyer, Jr., <u>The Cyclical Effects of the Unemployment</u>
<u>Insurance (UI) Program</u>.  Metrica, Inc.
NTIS PB91-197897.

Terry R. Johnson, and Daniel H. Klepinger, <u>Evaluation</u>      91-4
<u>of the Impacts of the Washington Alternative Work</u>
<u>Search Experiment</u>.  Battelle Human Affairs Research
Centers.
NTIS PB91-198127/AS.


<u>1992</u>


Walter Corson, Paul Decker, Shari Dunstan and            92-1
Stuart Kerachsky, <u>Pennsylvania Reemployment</u>
<u>Bonus Demonstration  Final Report</u>.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB93-152684.


Stephen A. Wandner, (editor) <u>Self Employment Programs</u>   92-2
<u>for Unemployed Workers</u>.  Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB92-191626/AS.


<u>Employer Layoff and Recall Practices</u>.                  92-3
Bureau of Labor Statistics.
NTIS PB92-174903/AS.


<u>UI Research Exchange</u>.  Information on Unemployment     92-4
Insurance research.  1992 issue.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB93-117968.


Wayne D. Zajac and David E. Balducchi, (editors)         92-5
<u>Papers and Materials Presented at the Unemployment</u>
<u>Insurance Expert System Colloquium, June 1991</u>.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB93-202695.


Robert G. Spiegelman, Christopher J. O'Leary,            92-6
and Kenneth J. Kline, <u>The Washington Reemployment</u>
<u>Bonus Experiment  Final Report</u>.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB93-159499.

Paul T. Decker and Christopher O'Leary,                    92-7
An Analysis of Pooled Evidence from the Pennsylvania
and Washington Reemployment Bonus Demonstrations.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. and W.E.
Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
NTIS PB93-160703.


## 1993


Paul L. Burgess and Stuart A. Low,                         93-1
Unemployment Insurance and Employer Layoffs.
Arizona State University, Department of Economics.
NTIS PB93-205573.



John G. Robinson, New Forms of Activity for the            93-2
Unemployed and Measures to Assist the Creation of
Self-Employment: Experiences and Opportunities in
Combatting Unemployment.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB94-145299.


## 1994


Jacob M. Benus, Michelle Wood, and Terry R. Johnson,       94-1
First Impact Analysis of the Washington State
Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED)
Demonstration.
Abt Associates.
NTIS PB94-162203.



Walter Corson and Anu Rangarajan,                          94-2
Extended Benefit Triggers.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB94-178290.



Jacob Benus, Michelle L. Wood, and                         94-3
Neelima Grover, Self-Employment as a Reemployment
Option: Demonstration Results and National Legislation.
Abt Associates.
NTIS PB94-188679.

The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System:          94-4
Legislation, Implementation Process and Research Findings.
Unemployment Insurance Service.
NTIS PB95-172730.


                              1995


Robert F. Cook, Wayne Vroman, Joseph Kirchner,                 95-1
Anthony Brinsko and Alexandra Tan, The Effects of
Increasing the Federal Taxable Wage Base for
Unemployment Insurance.
KRA Corporation.
NTIS PB95-216545.



Walter Corson and Joshua Haimson, The New Jersey               95-2
Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration
Project: Six-Year Follow-Up and Summary Report.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
REPLACED BY REVISED VERSION OF UI OCCASIONAL PAPER 96-2



Wayne Vroman, The Alternative Base Period in                   95-3
Unemployment Insurance:   Final Report.
The Urban Institute.
NTIS PB95-232401.



Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment                  95-4
Strategy.
Unemployment Insurance Service
NTIS PB95-225777.




                              1996


Evaluation of Worker Profiling and Reemployment               96-1
Services Systems   Interim Report.
Social Policy Research Associates and Mathematica
Policy Research, Inc.
NTIS PB97-183248

Walter Corson and Joshua Haimson, <u>The New Jersey</u>                96-2
<u>Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration</u>
<u>Project:  Six-Year Follow-Up and Summary Report.</u>
<u>REVISED EDITION</u>
NTIS PB97-183289


<u>1997</u>


Robert F. Cook and Anthony E. Brinsko <u>Employee Leasing:</u>        97-1
<u>Implications for State UnemploymentInsurance Programs:</u>
<u>Final Report</u>
KRA Corporation
NTIS PB-97165062


Wayne Vroman, <u>Unemployment Insurance, Welfare and</u>              97-2
<u>Federal-State Fiscal Interrelations:</u>
<u>Final Report</u>
The Urban Institute
NTIS PB97-165047


<u>Evaluation of Short-Time Compensation Programs.</u>                97-3
Berkeley Planning Associates and Mathematica
Policy Research, Inc.
Available soon at NTIS.


<u>1998</u>


<u>Emergency Unemployment Compensation: The 1990s Experience</u>.    98-1
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
Available soon at NTIS.